

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**FACSIMILE COVER PAGE**

Date: February 21, 2003	Time: 11:11 AM
To: Patent and Trademark Office	For Information Call: David J. Gaskey, Esq. (248) 988-8360
Fax Number: 1-703-308-7382	At: Carlson, Gaskey & Olds
From: David J. Gaskey	Fax Number: (248) 988-8363
Pages (including cover page): 5	Client Billing Number: 60,469-031

Application No. 09/740,231

Courtesy copy of Response After Final previously submitted on January 20, 2003.

FAX RECEIVED
FEB 21 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

400 West Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, MI 48009

*** TX REPORT ***

TRANSMISSION OK

TX/RX NO	3556
CONNECTION TEL	17033053432
SUB-ADDRESS	
CONNECTION ID	
ST. TIME	01/20 14:13
USAGE T	00'55
PGS.	3
RESULT	OK

00,409,431

UT-4791

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Gieras, et al
Serial No.: 09/740,231
Filed: 12/18/00
Group Art Unit: 2834
Examiner: Elkassabgi, Heba
Title: METHOD OF MAKING TRANSFER FLUX MOTORS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX RECEIVED

FEB 21 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed on November 20, 2002.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103. The proposed combination of *DeCesare* with *Blissenbach, et al.* cannot be made. The proposed modification to *DeCesare* provides no benefit and defeats an intended operation of the teachings of that reference. Where a proposed combination or modification to a primary reference provides no benefit or defeats an intended operation of the device of the primary reference, the legally-

60.469-031
OT-4791IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Gieras, et al
Serial No.: 09/740,231
Filed: 12/18/00
Group Art Unit: 2834
Examiner: Elkassabgi, Heba
Title: METHOD OF MAKING TRANSFER FLUX MOTORS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

FAX RECEIVED

FEB 21 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed on November 20, 2002.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103. The proposed combination of *DeCesare* with *Blissenbach, et al.* cannot be made. The proposed modification to *DeCesare* provides no benefit and defeats an intended operation of the teachings of that reference. Where a proposed combination or modification to a primary reference provides no benefit or defeats an intended operation of the device of the primary reference, the legally-required motivation to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness is absent.

In this case, *DeCesare* explicitly teaches a particular arrangement of coils on a stator to achieve "an AC alternator which establishes magnetic flux fields both at the peripheral as well as at the axial surfaces of the rotating rotor, with the stator being designed to couple to all of the rotor flux fields." (Column 1, lines 53-57). *DeCesare* achieves this by the specific arrangement of coils shown in that reference. *DeCesare* teaches, "Another important feature of the present

60,469-031
OT-4791

invention is the provision of a stator which includes armature coils distributed *thereon* and arranged proximate to the rotor to magnetically couple with the flux at the peripheral and axial surfaces to thereby enhance voltage induction." (Column 3, lines 61-65, emphasis added). "The axial wall portions 20b and 20c are substantially flat and are arranged to bridge or extend into the lateral flux fields to thereby cause the flux at the rotor axial surfaces to be coupled to the armature coils 24 *in* the slots 20d." (Column 4, lines 9-13, emphasis added).

If one were to substitute a winding as shown in the *Blissenbach, et al.* reference for the specific coil arrangement of *DeCesare*, the intended flux coupling at the axial surfaces of *DeCesare* would be lost. As quoted, *DeCesare* requires the coils to be *on* the stator and *in* the slots 20d. If one substituted the winding of *Blissenbach, et al.*, the arrangement of *DeCesare* would no longer work as intended.

Alternatively, if one were to substitute the yoke and winding arrangement of *Blissenbach, et al.* for the stator arrangement disclosed in *DeCesare*, the axial flux coupling would be lost entirely. The yoke portions of *Blissenbach, et al.* do not permit for the axial extension over the axial surfaces of the rotor as required by *DeCesare*.

There is no motivation for making the combination. *DeCesare* discloses a specific arrangement that achieves a specific goal. Substituting in the arrangement of *Blissenbach, et al.* or otherwise modifying *DeCesare* to include a winding as shown by *Blissenbach, et al.* would defeat the intended operation of *DeCesare* and provides no benefit. The combination cannot be made.

None of the claims are obvious. As all rejections begin with the combination of *DeCesare* and *Blissenbach, et al.*, none of the rejections establish a *prima facie* case of

60,469-031
OT-4791

obviousness. The additional teachings of *Peck, et al.*, *Weh*, and *Lange, et al.* do not remedy the defect in the proposed combination.

Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

David J. Gaskey
Registration No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: January 20, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner Heba Elkassabgi, Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (703) 305-3432 on January 20, 2003.


Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\Ip00031\parent\Request for Reconsideration 1-20-03.doc

FAX RECEIVED

FEB 9 1 1903

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600